

15
A
DISCOURSE,

SHEWING

That it is Lawfull, and our Duty

To swear OBEDIENCE to

KING William,

Notwithstanding the Oath of ALLEGIANCE
taken to the

L A T E K I N G.

By a Divine in the North.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Joseph Hall*, Bookseller in *New-
castle upon Tyne*. 1689.

1

CHICAGO

1891

CHICAGO

CHICAGO

CHICAGO

CHICAGO

CHICAGO

CHICAGO

CHICAGO

CHICAGO

TO THE
Renownedly Learned and Reverend
GILBERT BURNET, D.D.
Lord BISHOP of SARUM.

Reverend Sir,

MY Zeal for this present Government, (the happiest Change that ever Nation was blest with,) and my Trouble to see some remaining Scruples, which (in despite of all God's manifestations to us) seem yet to disturb our Israel, have so far transported me beyond the bounds of Modesty, and made me forget my own Weakness, as to thrust upon you this unworthy Pamphlet.

My Forwardness for the Cause had wellnigh put me upon the printing of it without farther consultation; but upon second thoughts I judg'd it safer in a matter, of this weight, to consult some of greater Learning: And whilst my thoughts were roving to find out some proper persons, (of which, upon several accounts, there are but few in this quarter of our World,) attracted with the fame of Your Worth, and Learning, and the sense of Your

Epistle Dedicatory:

great Actings in our happy Change it self, they seemed to bend to You-wards. And though a person of less Business, and less Note, might very well have served to examine so pitifull a Piece, yet promising my self better usage from You, whose Candour must be answerable to Your Greatness, than perhaps I might meet with from some of lesser note, I resolved, however bold it might appear in me, to take this way. Accept therefore, Reverend Sir, this poor Piece, which however rude it be, if it be but sound I care not: And though it was very fond of the journey, to come and present it self to You, yet it will, upon the approach of so grave a Censure, (methinks) begin to tremble. And if I be prevented by any other who (questionless) may doe it better, I am very well pleased with the Service which may be done to my Sovereigns by it, and think my self sufficiently rewarded for my poor Endeavours, that I had the Honour of expressing to You my readiness in them. God preserve You, Reverend Sir, and enrich his Church more and more with such noble Patriots.

A Dis-

A
DISCOURSE,

SHEWING

That it is Lawfull, and our Duty

To swear OBEDIENCE to

KING William,

Notwithstanding the Oath of ALLEGIANCE
taken to the late King.

AMong the many Scruples of Con-
science, which have risen from
this turn of Times, the greatest,
in my opinion, and (I hope) the
last is this: Whether or no it be
lawfull for those, who have sworn Allegiance
to the late King, to takè this new Oath of Alle-
giance to King *William*.

B

This

This is the great Scruple which, I find, cannot easily be shaken off by men even of greatest Learning, and greatest Integrity ; and if men could but once clear themselves of this, I hope, there will remain no farther cause of Scruple.

And although I do not pretend to prescribe Rules to others, who are wiser and better than my self, yet what I here write for my own satisfaction, may perhaps be somewhat satisfactory too to such whose want of leisure, or other lets, may hinder them from making enquiry into the thing themselves.

First then, There are two preliminary Questions necessary to be considered, in order to the resolving this present Scruple.

The first is, Whether or no I can be any longer obliged to a man by Oath, or otherwise, when he himself is divested of that Power, in consideration of which I was by Oath, or otherwise, obliged to him ? And it is certain I cannot. The thing is so common, and clear, that it needs not much proving, there being daily instances of the thing : For though a man is obliged

liged to a Lord of a Manour, a Magistrate, or Master, so long as they are such, yet when they once cease to be such, and are superseded by Oaths, my Obligation, how strong soever, doth then cease, and I may a-new be obliged to the Succeder.

The next Question is, Who is to be owned as supreme? He who was once our lawfull King, or he who by Force, or otherwise, hath dethroned this King, and is himself seated upon the Throne?

And in my opinion, the last is supreme; for the bearing of the Sword is so inseparable from the supreme Power, that the very Life of Supremacy consists in it; and it is as improper to call him King who wants Power, as to call him a man, who wants Reason.

A King is set over a People by God, as his Vice-gerent, and endued with Power sufficient to encourage and defend the righteous, and punish the wicked; but when God takes from him all Power, so that he can neither doe the one, nor the other, How can he be called

God's Vice-gerent, and Supreme ? Is not he rather to be called so, and to be look'd upon to be such, upon whom God hath transferr'd this Power ?

And as he who is lawfully ejected can no longer lay any Claim to that Estate out of which he is ejected, but he is to be owned as Lord, who is lawfully possess'd of it ; so when God, who hath the sole Disposal of Crowns, and may give them to whom he pleases, doth dispossess a King of a Crown, and puts another in his place, we are then to acquiesce. It's true, whilst the thing is in dispute, it is the part of every honest man, to stand up for his King as much as he can, but when once the business is ended, and actual Possession given, (which could never be without God's *Fiat*, who himself is the Judge of Kings, and putteth down one, and setteth up another,) there is then no farther Appeal to be made, or Writ of Errour brought, unless we think we are higher than God, and have a better Right to dispose of Crowns than he; we are therefore to own him as supreme, whom God hath set up, and not obstinately to stand out for him who is actually dispossess'd.

Again :

Again : Since the Tribute, and Revenues of a Crown are the Stipend of God, (if I may call it so,) appropriated by God to the supreme Powers, as his Ministers, it being necessary for the support of their Grandeur, and Carrying on of their Business, and therefore, *St. Paul* saith, They are God's Ministers attending continually upon this very thing : When then this Tribute is quite taken from one, and given to another, so that it is impossible for him from whom it is taken to appear any longer as the Minister of God, and carry on his Business, God then seems to me to have actually discharged such an one from his Service, and to have pitcht upon the other to be his Minister, to whom the Tribute is paid : And therefore it seems clear to me, that he is to be owned as Supreme, and God's Minister, who actually possesseth the Throne, and the Appurtenances thereof; and not he who was once King but is now dispossess'd :

As for that nice Distinction of a King *de jure*, and a King *de facto*, I look upon it to be a mere *Chimera*, and no way practicable. A man cannot serve two Masters, as our Saviour saith : We must suppose this King *de jure* to be a King,
and

and if he be a King, he must be acknowledged for such, and have all the Honour and Service paid him which is due to a King.

Again: The King *de facto* must be acknowledged too to be a King, and being so, must be honoured and served as a King; now what can a man doe in this case? If he serve the one he must neglect the other, if he cleave to the one, he must forsake the other; he cannot serve them both, they both laying Claim to the same Services. Since then it is impossible to serve them both, there can be no such thing in Nature as two Kings, a King *de jure*, and a King *de facto*; for we know that Nature designs an End to all her Actions, but there can be no such Action where the End is impossible: The Query is then, Since there must be but one King, which of the two is he? The King *de jure*, or the King *de facto*? It is certain the last is he.

My Argument is this: Affairs cannot be managed by Fancy, and Suppositions; there must be acting in the case: Now a King *de jure* is only an empty Title, and cannot act, the whole
Power

Power of Acting being in the King *de facto* ; and therefore unless you think you can live upon mere Notions, you must of necessity have recourse to the King *de facto*, and own him as Supreme, since he is only in a capacity to act.

And whereas it is said, That the Crown cannot be forfeited, and that therefore a King whilst he lives can never cease to be King ; *Once King, and always King.* To this I answer : Grant that it cannot legally be forfeited, and that though the Law obliges the King, yet it cannot punish him ; and that the Law hath so fenced about the Persons of Kings, that it is impossible in the sense of the Law, for a King upon any Trespas whatever to forfeit his Crown ; and that there is no Subject can offer any Violence, or attempt any thing against the Prerogative or Person of the King, but at the same time he becomes a Trespasser of the Law, and by the Law is punishable ; grant all this I say, that the Laws of the Land do, as much as they can, secure the Right of Dominion in the Person of a King, and his Successors, so that as far as they can make him, he is King *de jure* ; yet
jure

jure they can never make him so absolute, but that God hath still a Right above him, and Power to depose him ; and whenever he doth it, the Right, and Power, which were by Law deriv'd, or secur'd to that King, must then cease, and be null : And therefore (in my opinion) let such a King , and his Abettors pretend to what they will, and lay Claim to the Crown as much as they please, by virtue of this and the other Constitution of Government, yet such Claim is quite out of doors, when there is another King *de facto* ; and the King *de facto* is King *de jure*, and claims under a far greater Right ; for it is *Jure divino* that Kings reign, but it is only *Jure humano* that they are hereditary, or elective, that there is this or the other sort of Government. It is certain therefore, that though it be granted, that the Crown cannot legally be forfeited, yet it may be otherwise lost, and seized on ; God may make a Forfeiture of it, and dispose of it to whom he pleases ; otherwise there can be no Conquerour in the World can have any Right to the Crown, which he conquers.

But

But you will say, A Conqueror is one thing, and an Usurper is another ; you will own a Conquerour to be supreme, even when the conquered King is living ; but you will not own an Usurper to be so : And thus (I know) many will talk, but (if I may be so bold as to say so) it's just at random, never knowing, nor weighing what Reason there may be for the one more than the other : But I am resolv'd, with the little Wit I have, to pause upon things better, before I swallow them down so inconsiderately. Let us then compare the Conquerour and Usurper together, and see wherein the Excellency of the one lies above the other.

And first then, Grant that some Conquerours have at first been on the defensive side, and have had just Cause of War, yet they were not so just to give over, when they have got sufficient Reparations ; but being heartened with Success, would admit of no Terms, but went still on, till they had ruin'd their neighbouring Prince : This (I am sure) was neither just, nor lawfull ; and yet, being Conquerours, their Supremacy is owned: But

C

where

where there is one who at first hath had just Cause of War, there are many of them for this one who had not, but invaded their Neighbours purely out of Ambition, and a desire to enlarge their Dominions: This surely was unjust, and yet their Supremacy is owned. I ask then, What is the cause why we may lawfully own their Supremacy? Is it the unlawfulness of their War? No sure; that cannot be it. What can it be then? Truly nothing else, but because they prov'd victorious, and possess themselves of the Throne. Now then, if a Conquerour is to be owned as Supreme, because he is possess of the Throne, though his War was illegal; I ask, Why an Usurper is not to be owned as Supreme, when possess of the Throne, though he too came illegally to it?

It's true, you may say, you look not upon an illegal War to be so heinous as Rebellion; I grant it; but yet I look upon them both to be unlawfull Means of coming to a Crown.

The

The truth of it is, though the Lord can not be the Authour of the Evil of Sin, yet he is the Authour of the Evil of Punishment. *Can there be evil in the City, (saith Amos,) and the Lord hath not done it?* And God, in whose Power alone it is to punish Kings, may punish them as well by the Hand of a Rebel, as an Invader. We have so many instances of this, and those so clearly owned by God too, that it is not to be questioned; and he hath too as clearly owned these very men to be set up by him, and to be his Kings, who (though they had no good design of their own in it) were yet designed by him, for the Punishment of those other Kings whom they dispossessed. And when they are thus set up, surely they are Supreme, and are to be owned as such, unless we will prove *οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῶν*, and fight against God. And therefore, if we first have recourse to examples taken out of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, we shall find, that though Rebels (for such they were, when they did it without a special Commission from God) did rise up, and kill their Kings, and possess their Thrones, that the People were yet subject unto them; and they are listed among the other King's,

and their Reigns set down as Kings in the sacred Cronicle, but (it's true) with the infamous addition too of the Treason which they wrought. And when it pleased God that they should be serv'd in the same kind, yet (of so sanctifying a nature) is the Enjoyment of the Crown) even the persons of those Usurpers were by it accounted so sacred, that even they who rebelled against them, following their example, are by the Holy Ghost branded for Traitors, and punish'd accordingly. I shall for brevity sake, refer you to the Scripture it self, where you shall find Examples of this in many, if not in most of the Kings of *Israel*.

But to deal fairly, as one who is not wedded to his opinion, but desires to inform and be informed, there is one instance amongst the Kings of *Israel* which seems to make against me; and it is that of *Zimri*, who killed *Elah*, and was himself within seven days killed by *Omri*, whom all the People of *Israel* assisted. But we must consider, that he was not seated upon the Throne of the Kingdom, but reigned only in one City, namely,

Tirzah,

Tirzah, all the rest of the Kingdom disowning him.

But there is another Example amongst the Kings of *Judah*, which seems to make much more against me, and to be the very Case in hand. *Athaliah*, the Queen-Mother, her Son *Abaziah*, King of *Judah*, being dead, arose, and destroyed all the Seed Royal, and possess'd her self of the Throne, and reigned seven Years, (a considerable time to have ended all Disputes, if the Case had not been extraordinary;) *Jehoshebah*, his Aunt, having saved *Joash*; the only Son of *Abaziah* that was left unkill'd, hid him all that time; and then *Jehoiadab* the Priest acquainting the chief Officers with it, brought him forth, where, with an unanimous consent, he was forthwith proclaim'd; with the shouts of which proclamation, *Athaliah* being allarm'd, and incens'd, runs into the Temple, and seeing the young King upon the Throne, doth therein her own right, her self being Herald, forthwith proclaim them Traitors, crying, *Treason, Treason*; but they were so far, from taking notice of any thing of a Claim which she made to the Crown,

Crown, or of her Accusation of Treason which she laid against them, that, as *Jehojadah* had before ordered it, she was forthwith taken out, and executed. And certainly either this instance or none will be able to make out, That Usurpers, when seated upon the Throne, are yet to be deposed, and the King *de jure* only to be owned. And I have the rather quoted this instance, because I expect it may be instanced against me; and therefore resolved throughly to discuss it, as well for my own, as for the Satisfaction of others. But though it seems to make so much against me, and though I have set it out as much as I could, to the advantage of the contrary Opinion, yet I shall now shew wherein it falls short, or rather indeed makes for my side.

And first, If we consider who the person was, who was the main instrument of this Change, we shall find it to be *Jehojadah* the Priest, and we must needs think, that he being satisfied that the Child was preserved alive, would in this grand Concern consult the Oracle of God, to which he might have recourse,

course, and the consulting of which was his Office. Again, We have the grounds upon which he and the People proceeded to this Change clearly set down, 2. *Chro.* 23.3. it was an Oracle delivered by God to *David*, that there should allways be a Male of his Seed, to sit upon his Throne; they therefore taking this Promise of God to *David* as an infallable Truth, and finding accordingly, that beyond all expectations there was a Male Child preserv'd of that Line, they therefore waving all other obligations, did stick to this Divine Oracle: So that the Case is vastly different from any thing that could have happened since, they then having God's special directions in the thing; and this Child (as were all the Kings of *Judah*) being a King *de jure* indeed, but of such a *jure*, that never King in the World, since our *Shiloh* came, can lay claim to the like; for if it had been only such a *Jus*, as our Kings have to the Crown; they might as well at first have stood up against the Usurpers in behalf of *Jehosheba*, to whom (according to the tenure of bare Succession) the Right of the Crown did devolve, after the slaughter of her Nephews. But this
they

they did not. And here lest I overslipt it, I must (however out of order) take notice of a very remarkable Point, which is this : That the People offer'd not to stirr (which I shall presently prove) in defence of the Succession against *Athaliah*, who was possess'd of the Throne; nay, though *Jeboſheba*, who by Succession was the right Heiress to the Crown, was alive : And this may serve to satisfy those men, who are so stiff, that they will not own the King *de facto*, whilst the King *de jure* (as they term him) is alive.

And now I am to make out, that this instance makes more for my opinion, than the contrary.

It is recorded, that *Athaliah* reigned all those seven years, till it came to light that the Child was preserved ; and if she reigned, it must be granted, that she had the same Power, as well over Priest as People, which the Kings of *Judah* had ; and we never read that *Jebojadah*, or any other, were before disobedient to Her, till it was known that there was a Male-Heir, who by the particular direction
of

of God was to reign. And it must be presumed, that they would still have own'd her as Supreme, if this had not come to light, though she came to the Crown by most Illegal and Bloudy means; for it cannot be supposed that *Jehoadab* knew any thing of the first hiding of the Child; and therefore might from the very first be disobedient to her; for it would have been unsafe to have conceal'd it so long: And it cannot be said that he expected a more fit time to publish it, when the Child should be of discretion to govern; for even when he was crown'd, he was but seven years old, which (I am sure) are not years of discretion: It follows therefore, that *Jehoadab* knew nothing of it; and therefore must be presum'd till then, to have liv'd in subjection to *Athaliah*, as supreme. And now I leave it to the World to judg, whether this instance (however it might seem at first to make against me) doth not make more for me, than for those who are of a contrary Opinion.

The next thing then that we must have recourse to, is the Practice of the Primitive
D Christians;

Christians; and I dare challenge any man to tell me, which of them in all those many Revolutions of Affairs, when the succeeding Emperours were allways by indirect means supplanting their Predecessors; Which of them (I say) did ever deny Subjection to the Emperour in being, however unlawfully he came to the Throne? Nay, I shall give you an instance to the quite contrary. *Philippus Bardas* was Emperour, and (if we believe *Eusebius*) was Baptiz'd, and a Christian, and therefore must certainly be mightily endear'd to the Christians, who never before had any Emperour of their Persuasion, but Emperours who most of them did persecute them in most cruel manner. Now certainly, the loss of this Emperour would trouble and offend them, and render them (if ever) disaffected to the Government of the succeeding Emperour *Decius*, who depos'd him, and murdered him; yet for all this, so far were they from disowning the present Emperour, who yet came so unworthily to the Throne, that they thought it their duty to pray for him, and not only for him, but afterwards for *Gal-lus*, who succeeded him, and was in every respect

respect as bad as he. *He chased away* (saith Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, in his Letter to Hermanmon) *the Holy men which pray'd for Peace, and his prosperous state, and so together with them he banished the Prayers continually poured unto God for him.* Euf.
l. 7. c. 1.

And surely we cannot think that those undaunted Champions of Christianity could, to save themselves, be in the least guilty of any Flattery, or idle Complement; no sure; but this they did, being thereunto oblig'd by the Holy Scriptures, wherein we are commanded to pray for Kings, that we may lead a quiet, and godly life under them; and surely we have still greater reason to pray thus for the worst of Kings, because they are in greatest danger of being disturbed, and disturbing other.

And if indeed the Practice of those primitive Christians had been such as to disown their Authority, and seek to disturb them, and yet at the same time to pray for their peaceable Reign, their Prayers, and Practice

being so diametrically opposite, they would certainly have been lookt upon, (and that justly too) as the worst of men, and no way to be trusted.

And though the blasphemous Complement of *Boniface* to *Phocus* was more than Flattery, and an espousing of his barbarous way of accession to the Crown; yet if he had only been subject to him, and pray'd for him, when seated upon the Imperial Throne, he had done no more than all good Christians then did, and might lawfully doe.

Honest *St. Martin* did much better, who drinking to his Deacon, and not to the Emperour, let him see (though indeed too haughtily, tartly, and publickly, not like a Courtier, nay, nor a prudent Bishop, whose likelier way to work upon the Emperour had been to have reprov'd him deliberately, calmly, and privately, this other being the ready way to have disoblig'd, and quite lost him) let him see (I say) that his unjust way of coming to the Crown was displeasing to God, and did deserve his Fatherly Correction, and Penance.

Now

Now this was all that he did, and this is that which every Ghostly Father of a King ought, and may doe, to admonish him of his sins, and yet at the same time own his Supremacy.

And I look upon him, who, in those great Debates here in *England* betwixt the Houses of *Lancaster* and *York* about the Crown, did live peaceably under that King that was possesst of the Throne, to have been far the better Subject, and better Christian, than he whose turbulent Spirit was still for Change, and was the occasion of so much War, and Bloudshed.

And thus I have made it out, that not only a Conquerour, but an Usurper is to be owred as Supreme, and to be set up by God, when possesst of the Throne.

But then the Query is, how far he must be possesst of the Throne, that we may acknowledge him set up by God, and desist from any farther opposition.

It's

It's true, we have no such Revelations now as were in the times of the old Testament, and therefore may still be at a stand, when such Kings are fully set up by God; yet, if I may spend my weak judgment upon it, I look upon a King to be thus set up, when the former King, and his Heirs, being either banish'd, kill'd, or imprison'd, the other is seated upon the Throne; and so far, either for fear or favour, own'd by the Nation, that there is wholly a Cessation of Arms, or a very inconsiderable Opposition made.

And if God hath the same Power still (which to question were Blasphemy) to pull down and set up Kings when he pleases; and yet, since we cannot expect any Revelation from him, when he does it; either this Rule which I have here mentioned is the only way to know it, or else I would gladly know what other Rule we have to know it by.

But here it will be objected, That if Possession gives Right, the Law must be quite laid aside; and he that hath the strongest Arm will have the greatest Right; and so this
 Doctrine

Doctrine will be an Inlet to all Oppression and Violence.

To this I answer, That grant a King cannot be punish'd, and dispossest by due course of Law, and that therefore God (if I may say so) is forc'd for the punishing and dispossesting of Kings to use extraordinary means, which may tantamount to a Law; yet sure the Law is sufficient to take cognisance of Subjects, to punish them, and redress their Grievances one to another; and therefore they need not, and ought not to take these extraordinary means, which God sees often fit only and necessary for the punishing and dispossesting of Kings.

But of so intricate a nature is the Matter in hand, that I have scarce unravelled one doubt, when presently there arises another.

At this rate (say you) even a good King (instance King *Charles* the Martyr) may be destroyed by an Usurper, and yet the Usurper is not to be questioned, but own'd as Supreme: Certainly God never intended to destroy a good King so; and therefore if an Usurper
destroy

destroy such a King, he cannot be of God's setting up, and therefore is not to be owned as Supreme.

To this I answer, That I cannot without sorrow reflect upon the horrid Murther of that gracious Monarch, a Prince of unspotted Integrity, who was certainly the best of Kings, who for his Piety of Life might rid with the strictest Votaries, and for the manner of his Death, with the most famed Martyrs; and so far was he from bringing a Curse either upon the Nation, or himself, by any Sin of his own, that if ever the Goodness of a King could atone for the Sins of his People, his certainly could have done it. But it is not allways the sin of a King, which is the cause of such Overturnings, but very often indeed the sins of the People; though (God knows) we are too apt to lay the blame off our selves, and slander the Lord's anointed. And this happens according to *Samuel's* Menace to the People; that if they should doe wickedly, they should be destroy'd both they, and their King. God is many times pleased for the Punishment of a sinfull People to remove good Kings from them,

them, and to set Tyrants in their Place; and then even those Tyrants are of God's setting up, and are therefore to be owned as Supreme, and obey'd, as long as God pleases to continue them over us.

But here I am afresh assaulted with another Objection, so hard it is to struggle through this difficult Case: What! (say you) God is pleased to work by Means, (Miracles are now ceased;) and therefore, if we ourselves put not to our Hands, to pull down such Usurpers, but fondly own them still to be Supreme, and therefore not to be resisted, we may long look before we be delivered, and perhaps may offend God by slipping those Opportunities, which may seem for that purpose to be put into our Hands.

But to this I answer, That God, who hath the Power of Life and Death, is not so unprepared of Instruments of Death, as for want of others, to make allways use of one. He hath a store house (as I may say) of Accidents, and Diseases, out of which he may chuse any one sufficient to put a Period to the days of the

E greatest

greatest Monarch ; he can kill a King as soon by a Fever , as suffer a Rebel to kill him : And therefore though *David* knew that *Saul* was to be unking'd ; nay, and that he too was to succeed, yet so far was he from being of *Abisbai's* Opinion, that then was the opportunity to kill him, and that then God had delivered him into his hands, when they found him asleep, with the Spear at his Head, so far (I say) was he from being of his Opinion, and taking this opportunity, that he would neither doe it himself, nor suffer him to doe it; but piously, and prudently, told *Abisbai*, that God had means of his own to doe it by, and needed not to be beholden to them to doe it by such illegal Means; and therefore they were to expect his leasure. *As the Lord liveth* (saith he) *the Lord shall smite him, or his day shall come to dye, or he shall descend into the Battel, and perish.* The Lord forbid that I should stretch forth my hand against the Lord's Anointed ; and therefore let no Rebel think, that because God hath a mind to put down a King, that yet he shall be the less guilty, who stretcheth forth his Hand to doe it.

And

And now I have with what scrutiny I can discusst these two Preliminary Queries : In the answering the first of which there was little difficulty, it being a generally receiv'd Maxim, and Warrantable by the daily Practice of all sorts of People : The main Difficulty lies in the Second, which I think I have removed, to my own, if not to the satisfaction of others ; and have made it out, both by Reasons, and Examples, (and at the same time remov'd all the Objections, that might make against it,) that he is not King and Supreme, who was once King, but is depos'd ; but he is Supreme, who is actually in Power, and possess of the Throne.

And now let us take an estimate of our present Affairs, by what hath been here said.

It is certain, never Prince had juster Grounds of War, than this Prince had.

First, In respect of the true Religion which was groaning under the growing Tyranny of the Church of *Rome* : We had a King so bigotted to Popery, that for it's Propagation, he question'd not to break all that was most bin-

ding, all Promises of his own, and the Laws of the Land, which he swore to maintain; so that he may very well be rank'd amongst those Kings, whose saying is, *Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their Cords from us.* But let me not Reflect too much upon a Person, who is yet upon several accounts to be respected by us, let us rather admire the Goodness of God, who hath sent this Prince, as another *Constantine*, to deliver us from these impending ruines; for we may well say, *If the Lord had not sent us this Deliverer, they had swallowed us up alive, when they were so wrathfully displeased at us.*

Secondly, He had just Cause of War to defend his own Right, which the adverse Party laboured to debar him of: There was little good intended him, when Strangers, Papists, and Jesuits, his profest Enemies were set to manage Affairs, and were acquainted with all the Intrigues of Court; and yet neither he, nor any for him were in the least concerned, or taken any notice of. And when their young Prince was to be born, they did so industriously conceal all things from him, that they

they might as well have sent him word, that they intended to cheat him. He had just Cause therefore to vindicate himself, and his Right, from the abuses of such insolent Court-Parasites, and Impostors. And though it is true, he could claim no right by way of Succession, as long as his Father liv'd, yet, as a Foreign Prince, he might seek satisfaction for the Affront, which was put upon him, by such underhand, and illegal Dealings.

Thirdly, As the Cause of his War was just, so the Success was thereunto answerable: Never Prince was in an Undertaking more apparently favour'd by Heaven. But it were needless for me to enlarge upon all the happy Occurrences of this Expedition, since the Learned Dr. *Burnet*, who was an Eye-Witness of them all, hath already done it in his Sermon; which is almost in every man's hand, and therefore I refer you to it.

This I will only say, That never King came to a Crown with less Bloud-shed, with greater Applause, and Satisfaction of the People: And therefore since (as I have made it appear) even
those

those who come illegally to a Crown, are yet, when fully possess'd of it, to be own'd as Supreme; certainly King *William*, whose Cause of War was so just, and so miraculously victorious, and whose Proclamation over the whole Kingdom was so joyous to all, that in all Places where it was read, it may very well be said, *The shout of a King was among them*; certainly (I say) he is Supreme, he is of God's setting up.

And then it must needs follow, that if he be Supreme, the late King is not; for there cannot be two Supremes: And then it will follow again, that the Oath of Allegiance, and Supremacy, which we took to the other King, is now quite out of doors, all Supremacy, which was the ground of these Oaths, being now quite lost in the late King.

And then lastly, it will follow, That since King *William* is Supreme, we are in duty bound to pay him all that Honour, and Service, which is due to a Supreme; and then since swearing of Allegiance hath always been own'd as due to the Supreme Power from
the

the Subject, it is our Duty, when put upon it, to swear Allegiance to him too : And therefore (if I may be so bold to say so) I look upon it as an Errour in any (to say no worse of it) who refuse to doe it: As for my own part, as I have allways been Obedient to my Supreme, so I shall allways be Obedient to to King *William*, and Queen *Mary*, whose Supremacy over us I pray God long to continue.

FINIS.
